

FILE COPY

May 1983

NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES

A.E. Res. 83-19

POTENTIAL INTERSTATE INSTITUTIONAL ENTITIES FOR WATER RESOURCE PLANNING

Leonard B. Dworsky

and

David J. Allee

Department of Agricultural Economics
Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station
New York State College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
A Statutory College of the State University
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 14853

It is the policy of Cornell University actively to support equality of educational and employment opportunity. No person shall be denied admission to any educational program or activity or be denied employment on the basis of any legally prohibited discrimination involving, but not limited to, such factors as race, color, creed, religion, national or ethnic origin, sex, age or handicap. The University is committed to the maintenance of affirmative action programs which will assure the continuation of such equality of opportunity.

A Report to The
United States Water Resources Council

POTENTIAL INTERSTATE
INSTITUTIONAL ENTITIES
FOR WATER RESOURCE PLANNING

by Leonard B. Dworsky
Professor of Environmental Engineering

and

David J. Allee
Professor of Resource Economics

CORNELL UNIVERSITY
Ithaca, NY
14853

July 1980

Table of Contents

POTENTIAL INTERSTATE INSTITUTIONAL ENTITIES FOR ACCOMPLISHING US WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES PLANNING OBJECTIVES	1
Objectives	2
Genesis of Existing River Basin Planning Agencies	3
Tasks of Regional Basin Entities	7
Alternative Interstate Institutions	9
What is a Title II Commission?	9
Category 1: Potential Agencies	10
Category 2: Existing Agencies as Models	10
Illustrations -- Group I -- Growth, Energy and Regional Planning Entities	14
Illustrations -- Group II -- Education and Health Program Planning Entities	19
Illustrations -- Group III -- Boundary, Water Quality and Water Resource Planning Entities	23
Value and Use of Alternative Institutions	28
For Source Material, Contact	32
Annotated Bibliography	33

POTENTIAL INTERSTATE INSTITUTIONAL ENTITIES
(Other Than Existing River Basin Commissions)
FOR ACCOMPLISHING US WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL
WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES PLANNING OBJECTIVES

by Leonard B. Dworsky
and David J. Allee 1/

The United States Water Resources Council is implementing a national strategy for the planning of water and related resources under the authority of the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, as amended. One aspect of this strategy is to seek appropriate planning responses to the problems and opportunities in the 21 water regions of the nation. Six of these regions are included in River Basin Commission organizations established under Title II of the Water Resources Planning Act (New England, Great Lakes, Ohio, Upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Pacific Northwest Basin Commissions).

Where Basin Commissions do not exist, any initiative for the formation of additional Basin Commissions under Title II rests with the states. The Water Resources Council has developed mutually agreeable arrangements with entities other than Title II Basin Commissions (i.e., states, federal agencies, state-federal interagency groups). These arrangements facilitate development of plans for conservation, development and use of water and related resources and insure receipt of information about current and proposed plans.

In addition, the Council has formally recognized that governments in the several water regions of the nation may wish to establish water planning entities other than Basin Commissions that will be responsive to their perceived needs and that will cooperate with the Council. As a result, it has requested the preparation of this report to identify a range of potential interstate institutions for consideration in accomplishing the water and related resources planning objectives sought by both states and the Federal government.

1/ Professor of Environmental Engineering, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, and Professor of Resource Economics, Department of Agricultural Economics, respectively, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

This report:

- describes the objectives of the Water Resources Council in encouraging regional river basin planning entities other than existing river basin commissions;
- describes the genesis of existing river basin planning agencies (i.e., compacts, commissions, agreements);
- defines the tasks that regional basin planning entities need to accomplish in relation to Water Resources Council cooperation;
- identifies and describes alternative interstate institutions, existing or potential, including consideration of those not limited to water and related land resources planning that could accomplish the needed tasks; and
- summarizes and discusses the value and use of such alternative or potential interstate institutions in relation to objectives of the Water Resources Council interstate, regional and state water and related resources planning.

Objectives

Authority is contained in the Water Resources Planning Act^{2/} directing that the Water Resources Council shall:

(b) maintain a continuing study of the relation of regional or river basin plans and programs to the requirements of larger regions of the nation and of the adequacy of administrative and statutory means for the coordination of the water and related land resources policies and programs of the several Federal agencies; it shall appraise the adequacy of existing and proposed policies and programs to meet such requirements; and it shall make recommendations to the President with respect to Federal policies and programs.

In 1975 the Council established a program for the development of regional water resources management plans in areas without river basin commissions. On August 7, 1979, the Council directed its staff to strengthen the regional planning process. This was to be done by, among other things, reinitiating "regional water resource management planning in areas outside of Title II river basin commission areas".

The objectives of the Council and guidelines to be followed in achieving them include the following:

^{2/} P.L. 89-80; Title I; Section 102(b).

- to assist regional entities in developing comprehensive regional water and related land resources management plans;
- to develop plans within a framework of national goals and regionally agreed-upon goals and objectives;
- to insure that plans include specific quantified and ranked programs and project objectives for the subregions; and
- to insure that plans be formulated within the Council's Principles and Standards for Planning Water and Related Land Resources, 3/ the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, and be coordinated with other Federal programs (i.e., Environmental Protection Agency, Coastal Zone Management, Economic Development Administration, Soil Conservation Service, and the Corps of Engineers).

For each region, initial work objectives are:

- to establish an appropriate institutional structure which will facilitate a decision and action oriented process;
- to establish specifications of a planning process including time schedules and administrative and staffing programs suitable to develop plans; and
- to insure the intergovernmental coordination needed to implement the proposed planning process.

For each region, the Council

- will provide staff assistance;
- will encourage its member agencies to direct their field organizations to assist regional sponsors;
- will encourage participation of state water resource agencies (Title III, P.L. 89-80 grantees);
- staff will act as liaison in Washington for the development and distribution of approved regional plans and priorities, reports, and for the implementation of the Council's Consistency Policy; and
- staff will provide fiscal, personnel and administrative services required to maintain the (regional) sponsor activities and assist them in meeting their schedules, provide technical assistance upon request, advise on Council policies and guidelines, participate in sponsor work sessions and conduct briefings on this and the comprehensive, coordinated joint plan (CCJP) process.

3/ State and local projects will (can) be formulated within their own guidelines when outside the purview of Federal programs or requirements.

Genesis of Existing River Basin Planning Agencies

River basin planning agencies for water and related land management can be considered as having started with the establishment by Congress of the Mississippi River Commission. Added to this was the identification of the hydrologic unit as a proper framework for western water and land management by Major John Wesley Powell some one hundred years ago. About 30 years later Theodore Roosevelt proposed managing a river basin from headwaters to mouth, giving consideration to all useful purposes. Nearly 20 years more passed, a half century since Powell and the formation of the Commission, before the Army Corps of Engineers was granted authority in 1927 to undertake basinwide surveys for navigation, flood control, power and irrigation under the "308" reports (House Document 308, 69th Congress, 1927).

From 1934 to 1942, the National Resources Board and related agencies used the river basin extensively as the appropriate unit to outline water management problems and plans. During this period, TVA was established, the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin (INCodel) and the Potomac River Commission were organized, and discussions were initiated for an interstate compact in the Ohio River Basin to facilitate water pollution control.

By 1944, the principal federal water resources agencies were attempting to coordinate their plans through the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee and had established field interagency committees for the Columbia and Missouri River Basins. The Missouri River Basin Development Program, the first officially authorized basinwide plan, was initiated by the 1944 Flood Control Act. In 1948, the Ohio River Basin Water Pollution Control Compact Commission (Ohio River Valley Sanitation Commission), was officially established. On the same day President Truman approved the first major federal water pollution control law (P.L. 845, 80th Congress).

During the late 1940s and early 1950s, strong efforts were made to establish Missouri and Columbia Valley Authorities similar to the TVA. About the same time some of the states in both valleys sought to form compact agencies having broad planning responsibilities for essentially all water purposes. None of these efforts succeeded.

The nation built great physical works to control and manage water quantity and quality during the past 100 years. During this time it also made important strides in establishing management programs to conserve and enhance environmental values of both water and related land resources. It created a variety of organizations at all levels of government for executing, operating and managing such programs.

The evolution of Federal programs for most of this period has been in the direction of close congressional control. This has been particularly true for multiple purpose projects dealing with problems of flood control, navigation, irrigation and related hydropower and watershed management. And it has been increasingly so for municipal water supply, fish and wildlife, pollution control and recreation. Notwithstanding new compacts in basins (such as the Delaware and Susquehanna) for Federal

and state partnership and even for expanding state programs, the Congress is leaned upon heavily to authorize and finance the major physical control works. The result is a continuation of strong Federal involvement.

The Federal role is too often emphasized because of the concentration of public interest on large interstate waterways and the monumental projects often associated with them. It has been matched in a quieter way by efforts at both the state and local levels. State efforts have concentrated in direct construction and in policy, regulatory, financial and technical service functions. The third leg of the Federal cooperative system is the local level. There have been municipal, county and metropolitan efforts for water supply, water quality management, drainage and local flood control, the control of environmental quality and public health protection, and the protection and conservation of land. These have played a major role in resource, economic, environment and health management. Lagging action, concern or responsibility on the part of any of the three partners creates imbalances and tends to reduce the effectiveness of the Federal system.

As the large interstate water system developments requiring new large Federal investments decline in size and number, the future concentration of effort is likely to involve greater state and local interest. Although the river basin may remain the basic planning entity for Federal programs, state and local programs may place greater management emphasis on substate and subbasin regions. New federal-state-local relationships can be expected to evolve.

Acceptance of the river basin unit does not mean that questions have not been raised about its value for all purposes. It is generally understood that the boundaries of river basins do not define economic or demographic, or, for example, power service regions. Students of basin planning have also raised important questions about the role of individual basin organizations (particularly along coastal areas). This is in view of the need for managing coastal zones and water resources over a wider (multibasin) region. Questions have also been raised about the role of basin organizations to meet the needs of the metropolitan communities. Thus, it is not surprising that states that share a river basin have not found it desirable to agree upon a uniform management structure. The types of basin entities include:

- 1) Interstate compacts involving primarily the states as voting members (although on occasion a Federal representative with voting privilege is authorized) traditionally used in the West for the allocation of waters common to several states,

- 2) Compacts involving pollution control for the Ohio River, the Red River of the North; New York Harbor and environs involving New York, New Jersey and Connecticut; and New England rivers; and elsewhere, and

- 3) Compacts involving states and the Federal government as full members with voting rights, as represented by the Delaware and Susquehanna River Basin Commissions.

Federal agencies such as the Corps of Engineers nationally, and the Water and Power Resources Services (formerly Bureau of Reclamation) in the West, are organized along geographic lines following river basins. They provide major programs through which the nation plans and, with the authorization and funding by the Congress, carries out a large share of its water and related land resources development activities. Other Federal agencies operate partly in a river basin mode and partly in a state geographic or substate/subbasin mode, as well. These are characterized by the Environmental Protection Agency (for basinwide pollution control plans), the Soil Conservation Service (for watershed plans), and the Fish and Wildlife Service (for cooperative river basin studies).

River basin interagency committees representing cooperative but informal coordination among the Federal agencies and the states have become less used during the past 15 years. But some are still active in the Arkansas, White and Red Rivers, the Pacific Southwest and the Southeast basin region.

Title II of the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 opened new opportunities for river basin planning by providing for establishment of commissions composed of Federal and state representatives on an equal basis for one or a group of river basins (a multibasin region). At present, the New England, Great Lakes, Ohio, Columbia, Missouri, and Upper Mississippi River Basin Commissions have been established. Such Title II Commissions are also subject to flexibility. The Souris-Red-Rainy River Basin Commission was organized and existed for five years. Upon completion of the Commission's comprehensive coordinated joint plan, a determination was made that operating costs did not warrant continuing it as a separate entity. It was subsequently included as part of the Upper Mississippi River Basin Commission.

Commissions have developed different programs reflecting a variety of circumstances and perceptions of problems. The New England River Basins Commission has pressed power plant siting, coastal zone coordination and nonstructural flood control, among other topics. The Upper Mississippi River Basin Commission has been specifically asked by the Congress to prepare a plan for navigation improvements, among other elements, that will strengthen the commission's coordinative influence. A state commission operating within a confined corridor and stressing water-related land use and aesthetic values was established by New York State in 1965 but is no longer in existence. The Hudson River Valley Commission's legacy remains as an example of substate regional river basin management. During its tenure, the Commission relied less on regulation and more on existing local and state authority and voluntary cooperation. Much was accomplished with direct assistance through public hearings, cooperative comprehensive planning, dissemination of information and money for land purchases and other uses. Interstate entities for the Hudson Valley have been studied but not adopted, although some cooperating units have been adopted by the states involved for other purposes, including some that affect water and related resources, such as the Tri-State Regional Planning Commission discussed following.

The Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, as amended, has directed a major part of its program (Title II Grants) to states to assist them in water resources planning activities. State programs, either by direct action or through authorizing legislation, can do and have done much to facilitate the solution of certain parts of river basin problems. State support can be provided through:

- authorization of special intrastate regional service areas as part of a broader basinwide plan,
- acting positively to assist in resolving metropolitan or intermunicipal problems,
- direct or indirect facilitation of financing of public works planning and development, including coordinated regional studies,
- direct construction, operation and maintenance of facilities, and
- other similar actions, such as the formation of conservancy type districts with broad powers for important subregional areas of a basin when deemed necessary for management of a wider plan.

Finally, metropolitan governments can aid materially in selected aspects of basinwide water management. Illustrations of effective agencies are the Metropolitan Water District (Los Angeles), East Bay Utility District (Oakland, California), Boston Metropolitan District Commission, Metropolitan Sanitary District (Cook County, Illinois), and Seattle Metro (Washington).

It is evident that the national experience provides a wide choice of institutional opportunities depending on the perception of needs. Tasks required of agencies are delineated and new agency forms to meet additional needs are proposed for consideration in the next sections of this paper.

Requisite Tasks of Regional Basin Entities

An interstate/regional river basin planning entity, working in collaboration with the Water Resources Council, must have the capacity to carry out certain tasks. These capabilities extend from some very clear legal powers (eg., contract signing) to some less easily defined political capabilities such as access to state and executive legislative leaders, members of Congress and local elected officials.

The place to start is with the significance of the fact that water runs downhill. The entity must be able to take into account the interests of the hydrologic unit(s) for which it will have planning responsibility. This does not mean that its legal authority and political effectiveness must be equal over the whole basin(s) involved. But it must be able to operate effectively in plan development, approval and utilization. At the very least, it must be able to serve as a forum and focus

for special studies, hopefully for Level B planning (basin planning that stops short of the detail necessary for project authorization). Ideally, it would have the capacity to adopt a Comprehensive Coordinated Joint Plan (CCJP) with attendant enforcement of the consistency policy among cooperating agencies on a basis equivalent to the Title II commission.

The many interests in basin planning have been well identified by the Water Resources Council Task Force on Planning Procedures and Plan Utilization. They state in their May 16, 1980 draft:

Private enterprise, local governments, substate and interstate regional entities, state agencies and institutions, and federal agencies dealing with the entire spectrum of resource, environmental, social and economic issues are involved. The degree of success achieved in harmonizing and reconciling these efforts is considered by this Task Force to be the ultimate test of the planning effort ... conflicts are inherent in basin plan development ... a neutral third party -- an arbiter -- is essential in (1) bringing the parties together; (2) coming to an understanding of the conflict; and (3) helping to bring about satisfactory resolution ... This is not a trivial aspect of the overall plan development process. /pp. 3-9 to 3-13/

Plan approval is a key to the Water Resources Council Consistency Policy. An approved regional plan may be adopted by the Council after they review it. Alternatively, it may delegate that authority to the regional entity, which is the preferred course of action. The Consistency Policy implies that individual Federal agencies had a reasonable chance to influence the plan. These agencies are expected either to be consistent or to seek Office of Management and Budget (and by implication, Congressional) concurrence to deviate. Similarly, the Consistency Policy provides a valuable lever to state agencies to bring about strengthened coordination of state and Federal program plans and policies. The stronger the original commitment to the plan, the more effective the Consistency Policy becomes.

Optimal utilization of the plan will not occur without some resources and skills invested. By its very nature a basin plan cuts across organizational and interest lines and requires bargaining capacity for the plan to be accomplished. Effort is needed to hold together the divergent interests. Accordingly, capacity must be provided to those who need it -- the Congress, the President, state and local agencies. It is particularly in the budgeting and authorization processes where the Consistency Policy will be made or broken. Consistency will be achieved in large measure because of the information that can be provided about the "costs" of being inconsistent. This is notwithstanding the plan review functions of the Water Resources Council as stated in Sec. 104, P.L. 89-80.

These considerations suggest that the more willing participation an entity already has or the easier that participation can be secured, the better. Either direct or indirect potential impact on power, prestige or income must be involved. A sense of permanency and capacity to follow up in implementation must exist or be created. Once an agency becomes a member, it must be made difficult to resign. When a consensus has been reached, it must be possible to hold participants accountable.

The entity must have a commitment from its participants that recognizes its establishment. Staff capacity, preferably with experience in planning coordination in natural resources, implies the ability to contract, hire, receive funds, pay expenses, keep files and own property. It must have a recognized purpose sufficiently broad to cover all aspects of water and related resources. Rules for conflict of interest should be adopted. Participants should be tied to the entity, either by formal membership provisions or by adequately binding memoranda of understanding. Panels, task force studies, hearings and more informal public participation activities must be encouraged by the structure or tradition of the entity.

Alternative Interstate Institutions

Alternative interstate institutions considered here are defined as institutional entities other than: river basin commissions organized under the Water Resources Planning Act; compact agencies of the states or of states and Federal government approved by the Congress; or Federal-state interagency committees organized and operated under charters approved by the Federal Water Resources Council. ^{4/} While these alternative interstate institutions are not meant to be prototypes of the formal Title II River Basin Commissions, there will be resemblance in achievements sought. To provide a backdrop for consideration of these alternative institutions, a brief review is provided defining a Title II Commission.

What is a Title II Commission?

Congress envisioned in Public Law 89-80 an entity to coordinate planning for river basins. This was a compromise between several models. It was not to be just a Federal coordinator, empowered to keep peace between independent, individual, often competing, Federal agencies. Nor was it a body to give the states veto power over Federal agency activities. The chairperson was to be an independent, Presidential appointee. The major Federal agencies were designated voting members, as were the states. The vice chairperson, a state member, was to coordinate state interests. Consensus was essentially required to adopt a policy or a plan element. Funding for year-to-year activity was largely through the Water Resources Council but shared by the states. Individual planning studies, which may also be funded by Federal agencies independently, were funded as a unit and supplemented by prior and ongoing agency activity.

Plans can be developed and adopted, priorities can be evaluated and set, implementation and follow-up can be achieved by entities with structures different than the Title II Commission. The CCJP and therefore the basis of the consistency test vary greatly from one basin to another. Likewise, the extent to which priority setting is carried out both in

^{4/} For lists of these institutions with references relating to organizing information, see US Water Resources Council. State of the States: Water Resources Planning and Management. April 1980.

form and in subsequent follow-up also varies widely. Needs and capability, the basis for agreement and support, vary widely. Thus, the output of planning, whatever the structure may be, will vary widely. The implication for this study of those facts is that the organizational requirements to produce a useful CCJP are more in terms of process than structure. A wide variety of structures can work. Some structural elements may increase the probability of greater completeness or commitment, coordination or detail. But almost any arrangement is sure to capture some of the gains from coordination during plan formulation.

Alternative interstate institutions are considered under two categories:

Category 1: Potential Agencies

Agencies within this category represent generic types that can be established to carry out functions required by or consistent with programs of the Water Resources Council. These generic types are discussed under the following headings:

- a new interstate agreement with explicit commitment to consensus,
- a new interstate agreement (Council of States - COS) modeled in general terms after a Council of Governments (COG) entity,
- a state as a lead agency with contractual or other arrangements with cooperating states, Federal agencies and others,
- a Federal agency as a lead agency with contractual or other arrangements with cooperating states, Federal agencies and others, and
- establishment of a new specific entity or specialized use of existing entities organized under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (as amended).

Category 2: Existing Entities as Models

The 1979 edition of the Council of States publication Interstate Compacts and Agencies lists about 1000 entities established to carry out interstate cooperative activities. The range of functions encompassed by these entities is wide and includes:

- | | |
|--|-------------------------|
| -- Bridge, Navigation and Port Authorities | -- Education |
| -- Child Welfare | -- Motor Vehicles |
| -- Conservation and Environment | -- Nuclear Energy |
| -- Corrections and Crime Control | -- Parks and Recreation |

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| -- Pest Control | -- Transportation |
| -- Planning and Development | -- Water Apportionment |
| -- Property | -- Water Pollution Control |
| -- Taxation | -- Water Resources and Flood Control |

Tables have been prepared illustrating a sample of entities from several of these functional areas and indicating the specifications of the organizing and operating elements established for each. It is important to view these tables as examples of state action to achieve interstate cooperation -- and NOT as specific recommended guides.

A set of specifications to be considered in establishing an interstate entity to carry out tasks required in cooperation with the Water Resources Council is presented. These specifications are based upon the above and other examples and upon recommended specifications for inter-governmental agreements suggested by the US Advisory Commission on Inter-governmental Relations.

Category 1: Potential Agencies

The diverse range of alternatives now practiced in the United States makes it apparent that present law -- both at state and Federal levels -- does not preclude either conventional or innovative approaches to solutions of problems involving intergovernmental relations in water resource project development and operation. ^{5/}

A New Interstate Agreement. The states have power^{6/} to establish a new interstate agreement to carry out those tasks necessary to develop a cooperative program with the Water Resources Council. There are few limitations about the content of an agreement devoted to achieving interstate cooperation for planning water and related resources for an interstate water region.

A New Interstate Agreement (a Council of States). The idea of a Council of States is patterned after the well-developed idea of Councils of Governments which have been active in metropolitan areas. (These include interstate metropolitan areas like the Washington, D. C. COG.)

^{5/} Wendell and Schwan. "Intergovernmental Relations in Water Resources Activities", prepared for the National Water Commission (NTIS No. PB 210-358), 1972.

^{6/} Ibid. pp. 13-14. "...almost anything that the states might wish to do can be legally supported as an exercise of the authority to promote 'health, safety, morals and general welfare' (the Police Power), the principal intergovernmental questions ... relate to the comparative capacities of the ... levels of government within the Federal System."

A State as a Lead Agency. There is no obstacle to a state taking the role as a lead agency in developing an interstate planning entity for water and related resources. All necessary contractual arrangements and memoranda of understanding can be executed through a lead state to achieve the purposes of a regional basinwide planning entity.

A Federal Agency as a Lead Agency. Similarly, a Federal lead agency can act to bring about collaboration and coordination of state, Federal and other agencies for purposes of a regional basinwide planning entity. This type of lead agency arrangement is conceived to be different than practice wherein a lead agency (i.e., Corps of Engineers) develops a coordinating committee as an advisory body only.

Establishment of a Regional Basin Entity Under the General Concepts Used to Establish an Economic Development Agency. The establishment of economic development agencies (i.e., Upper Great Lakes, Ozarks, Four Corners) involve wide ranging purposes and authorities. The intent here is to recognize the potential for establishment of an interstate water related planning agency under, or as part of the authority available through the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended.^{7/}

The following table provides a checklist of items to be considered in establishing an interstate/regional river basin planning entity. All matters listed are NOT pertinent in all situations. Agency leaders and their counsels are fully aware of their own situations. Accordingly, this checklist has purposely been kept brief in order not to imply a directive for organization.

^{7/} 42 U.S.C. § 3121 et. seq.; P.L. 89-136; P.L. 92-65; P.L. 94-487. Copies available from the US Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration, Office of Chief Counsel, 14th St. NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Table 1. Specifications to be Considered in Establishing an Interstate/Regional Water and Related Land Planning Entity

Purpose	What the functions of the organization are intended to be.
Geographic Coverage	Which states are involved and which specific region is covered.
Powers and Duties	What the organization is entitled to do in the pursuit of its purpose; what the organization's responsibilities and liabilities are.
Planning and Review Process	Procedures for taking action, voting, and for having actions checked.
Authorization & Representation	Specified sources of authority (i.e., constitutional, police power, executive, legislative reference); how the member parties are represented.
Cooperation	The extent to which the organization will work with other entities among, within and outside the member parties.
Reports	How, when and to whom the various actions of the organization must be communicated.
Planning	Specification of the area and details to be planned; the duration of the plan; relationship to other plans at other levels; degree of involvement in the use and application of the plan.
Special Districts	Subdivisions of the area covered created to facilitate the functioning of the organization.
Funding	How the budget of the organization is derived; who the sponsors are; apportionment of expenses among the sponsors; mechanisms for the organization to raise revenue independent of sponsors.
Meetings and Actions	Rules of order for conducting meetings and bringing actions; when the first meeting will be held; frequency of meetings; initial actions to be undertaken by the organization.
Other Matters	Clauses giving definitions, effective date, and, if temporary, termination date are important. Provisions for separability and/or dissolution should also be included.

Category 2: Existing Entities as Models

The following tables illustrate arrangements among states covering a variety of purposes. While the illustrations shown usually refer to a "compact" arrangement, the development of an interstate agreement without the need to formalize the agreement through Congressional action is quite common. Over a thousand compacts/agreements/interstate arrangements are in place involving all the states and territories associated with the United States. The following illustrations are provided solely to demonstrate some of these arrangements and to indicate their structural arrangement.

Illustrations -- Group I (With Statutory Citations)

Growth, Energy and Regional Planning Entities

- Case 1 -- Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission
 New Jersey: P.L. of 1966, Ch. 149 (1966)
 Pennsylvania: 73 P.S. 701
 US Congress: Advance consent by 1961 amendment to National Housing Act, 75 Stat. 170
- Case 2 -- Southern Growth Policies Board
 Alabama: S.B. 92 (1975)
 Arkansas: Act 327 (1973)
 Florida: Chap. 23.140, F.S. (1977)
 Georgia: H.B. 909 (1973)
 Kentucky: S.B. 56 (1974)
 Louisiana: Act 518 (1974)
 Mississippi: S.B. 2525 (1975)
 North Carolina: N.C. Gen. Stat. 143-490
 Oklahoma: Okla. Stat., 3501, 1978 Supp. (1978)
 South Carolina: S.B. 332 (1973)
 Tennessee: H.B. 114; S.B. 108 (1973)
 Virginia: Acts of the Assembly, Chap. 273 (1973)
- Case 3 -- Tri-State Regional Planning Commission
 Connecticut: Public Act 450, Laws of 1971; Ct. Code 16-339 (1971)
 New Jersey: Ch. 161, Laws of 1971 (1971)
 New York: Laws of 1972, Ch. 269 (1972)
 US Congress: 75 Stat. 170 (Housing Act of 1954, as amended)(1954)
- Case 4 -- Western Interstate Nuclear Board
 For statutory, legal and other information, write:
 Western Interstate Energy Board
 2500 Stapleton Plaza
 3333 Quebec Street
 Denver, Colorado 80207
 Telephone: (303)837-5851

Case 1. Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission

Purpose	To organize and conduct regional planning for the area
Membership Geographic Coverage	Bucks, Chester, Delaware and Montgomery Counties; City of Philadelphia, all in Pennsylvania. Burlington, Camden, Gloucester and Mercer Counties in New Jersey.
Powers and Duties	Provide public services, promulgate rules and regulations, adopt bylaws, prepare budget and work program, and to do "any and all things necessary, convenient or incidental within the scope of its corporate purpose".
Planning and Review Process	A majority of the members present from each state, including two of the three state officials from each member state, must vote affirmatively to make any action binding.
Representation	<u>Ex officio</u> commissioners: Secretary of Highways and Executive Director of the State Planning Board of Pennsylvania; Commissioners of Transportation and Community Affairs, New Jersey. One appointee of the governor of each state. One representative from each member county, and one representative each from the cities of Philadelphia, Chester, Camden, and Trenton.
Cooperation	Federal participation by Bureau of Public Roads and Federal Highway Administration, US Department of Transportation; Housing and Home Finance Agency, US Department of Housing and Urban Development for communication purposes. Comply with lawful and proper requirements of Federal agencies, cooperates with state and local agencies.
Reports	Copy of the minutes of each meeting goes to the governor of each state; publishes an annual report.
Planning	Responsible for planning, as well as constructing and maintaining highways and mass transportation services and facilities in the area.
Special Districts	None.
Funding	Appropriations from Federal, state and local governments decided annually; may charge tax exempt service fees.
Meetings and Actions	Regular meetings established by an executive committee. The chairperson may call special meetings after giving 10 days notice. Five members from each state must be present to conduct business.

Case 2. Southern Growth Policies Board

Purpose	To engage in research to promote orderly and effective plans for growth policies within the Southern Region.
Membership Geographic Coverage	The states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia.
Powers and Duties	The Board has the power to make studies, investigations and recommendations with respect to projects of interstate or regional significance, governmental programs, Federal assistance, population distribution, land use and urban development, interstate and regional transportation, and human and natural resources.
Planning and Review Process	Majority of total votes taken required for action to be binding; executive committee may make certain limited arrangements.
Representation	The Board shall consist of five members from each party state as follows: the Governor, two members of each state's legislature and two members serving at the Governor's request.
Cooperation	Authorized to participate in joint planning efforts with Federal and other state governments.
Reports	Reports annually to the governor and legislature of each member state. May at any time issue special reports as deemed desirable.
Planning	The Board shall prepare and keep a Statement of Regional Objectives identifying projects of regional significance and recommending approaches to regional problems. Revised and updated no less frequently than once every six years.
Special Districts	The Board may designate programs for specific subregions. Also can carry out comprehensive land use planning in an area of two or more contiguous states.
Funding	Annual budget request submitted to the governors of each party state. Apportioned according to a formula based on equal shares, population and per capita income. May accept gifts and grants from the Federal or any state government, any person, firm or association.
Meetings and Actions	Meets at least once a year; majority of members must be present to conduct business not handled by the executive committee.

Case 3. Tri-State Regional Planning Commission

Purpose	Responsible for comprehensive planning in the compact regions to assure the continued qualification for Federal funds.
Membership Geographic Coverage	New York City, and Westchester, Rockland, Orange, Putnam, Dutchess, Nassau and Suffolk Counties in the State of New York; Mammouth, Middlesex, Somerset, Union, Hudson, Essex, Morris, Passaic and Bergen Counties in New Jersey; Housatonic Valley, South Wester, Greater Bridgeport, Central Naugatuck, Valley and South Central Planning Regions in Connecticut.
Powers and Duties	To advise member states concerning comprehensive planning for the region, to act as a liaison to coordinate local planning; to enter into contracts; operates under sovereign immunity (i.e., cannot be sued without consent).
Planning and Review Process	A majority of members present from each party state is required to effect binding legislation. The governor of any party state may veto legislation within ten days.
Representation	Five representatives from each member state appointed according to each state's own procedures and the Chairman of the Planning Commission of New York City. An officer of the US Department of Housing and Urban Development and officers of the US Department of Transportation, and the Environmental Protection Agency. Federal representatives have no voting power.
Cooperation	Works closely with local planning agencies and Federal departments.
Reports	Publishes an annual report on finances and an annual report on activities.
Planning	Has done planning in such areas as transportation, land use recreation, housing, coastal zone management, pollution control, and the promotion of regional growth, employment and development.
Special Districts	Existing planning districts detailed in membership above.
Funding	State appropriations are apportioned 45 percent each by New York and New Jersey, and 10 percent by Connecticut. The Commission may also receive Federal grants.
Meetings and Actions	Meets and acts as the Commission sees fit; three commissioners from each state must be present to conduct business.

Case 4. Western Interstate Nuclear Board^{8/}

Purpose	To establish a board to assist the member states in effecting close cooperation in the field of nuclear energy.
Membership Geographic Coverage	The states of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington and Wyoming.
Powers and Duties	Shall encourage and promote cooperation, employment, development, applications and information with respect to nuclear energy. Study safety, health and other standards; make recommendations; advise and consult with member states.
Planning and Review Process	A majority of members present must vote in concurrence to make any action binding.
Representation	The Board shall be composed of one member from each party state designated or appointed in accordance with the law of that state.
Cooperation	Shall contract, borrow or accept the services of personnel from any state, or the United States, or any institution, person, firm or corporation. May act as a licensee, contractor or subcontractor to the United States government and any of the appropriate agencies, departments or committees.
Reports	Prepares, publishes and distributes such reports, bulletins, newsletters or other materials as it deems appropriate.
Planning	Must prepare a functional regional plan for carrying out its appointed duties.
Special Districts	None
Funding	The Board shall submit a budget to each party state that will be equally apportioned among states. The Board may accept any and all donations, gifts and grants in any form from the United States or any state government, any person, institution, firm or corporation, with the donor and conditions included in the annual report.
Meetings and Actions	Majority of members must be present to conduct business. Must meet annually to submit reports and elect officers.

^{8/} See Western Interstate Energy Compact and its agency, the Western Interstate Energy Board.

Illustrations -- Group II
(With Statutory Citations)

Education and Health Program Planning Entities

- Case 5 -- New England Health Services and Facilities Board
 Maine: P.L. 1963, Ch. 388, Me. Res. Stat. Title 22, Ch. 161 (1963)
 Rhode Island: R.I. Acts of Res. of 1963; Ch. 80 (1963)
- Case 6 -- Southern Regional Education Board
 Alabama: Act No. 227, July 12, 1949 (1949)
 Arkansas: H. Con. Res. 13, 1949 Sess. (1949)
 Florida: Ch. 25017 (H.B. 189) (1949)
 Georgia: H.R. No. 9-590, 1949 Sess. (1949)
 Kentucky: S.R. No. 53, March 25, 1950 (1950)
 Louisiana: Act 336, July 6, 1948 (1948)
 Maryland: Ch. 282 (1949)
 Mississippi: Ch. 284, April 13, 1948 (1948)
 North Carolina: S.R. 204, February 8, 1949 (1949)
 South Carolina: Jt. Res. No. 860, April 3, 1948 (1948)
 Tennessee: H.B. No. 774 (1949)
 Texas: S.B. No. 405 (1951)
 West Virginia: W.Va. Code, Act 10c, Chap. 18 (1956)
- Case 7 -- Tri-State Regional Medical Needs Board
 Maine: Me. Res. Stat. Ann. Title 22, Ch. 159, Sec. 601 (1957)
 New Hampshire: N.H. Res. Stat. Ann., 125-A (1957)
 Vermont: 18 V.S.A., Sec. 701-9 & 741-44 (1957)

Case 5. New England Health Services and Facilities Board

Purpose	To provide the highest quality of health services to residents of member states through a coordinated program of mutual assistance in the training and recruitment of health services personnel.
Membership Geographic Coverage	The states of Maine and Rhode Island, with provisions to be joined by the states of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Vermont.
Powers and Duties	Make bylaws, maintain offices, employ and discharge necessary personnel, keep financial records.
Planning and Review Process	A majority of members on the Board from each state is necessary to impose an obligation on such states. Must submit proposals to the constitutional process of each state.
Representation	Three resident members from each state appointed according to the laws of each state.
Cooperation	Limited in service to member states and rural communities therein.
Reports	Publishes at its own discretion.
Planning	Shall collect, correlate and evaluate medical health data of member states and publish proposals.
Special Districts	None.
Funding	Collects fees from publications; gifts, bequests, and grants; contributions from member states; investment in secured notes and bonds.
Meetings and Actions	Mandatory at least twice a year.

Case 6. Southern Regional Education Board

Purpose	To establish a board fostering development and joint use of higher education facilities throughout the region.
Membership Geographic Coverage	The states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and West Virginia with provision to be joined by any state, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.
Powers and Duties	Encourage, conduct and foster research; collect, analyze and interpret data; develop proposals for financing education; formulate suggested policies for improving education; make recommendations to appropriate governmental units and do "anything necessary and incidental" to implement the compact.
Planning and Review Process	Majority vote by members present required to make actions binding.
Representation	Each state shall appoint seven members to the Board; one of whom must be the Governor and two must be members of the state legislature; the remaining four serve at the pleasure of the Governor. Federal consent not required.
Cooperation	The Federal government is entitled to have not more than 10 representatives without vote; the board may provide information and recommendations to the Federal government; the Federal government may advise the board on matters of mutual interest.
Reports	The board shall make annual reports to the governor and legislatures of each party state and additional reports if they are deemed desirable.
Planning	It is the duty of the board to plan for the improvement of education.
Special Districts	None.
Funding	Annual budget request submitted by the board and apportioned to the states on the basis of population and per capita income. May accept and utilize gifts, grants and donations of any kind from the Federal government, any individual, firm, association, foundation or corporation.
Meetings and Actions	Shall convene at least once a year to elect the officers of the board and deliver reports. Majority of members must be present to conduct business.

Case 7. Tri-State Regional Medical Needs Board

Purpose	Advisory service to voluntary and official health agencies and to medical care education.
Membership Geographic Coverage	The states of Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine.
Powers and Duties	Employ necessary personnel, make bylaws, maintain offices, keep financial records.
Planning and Review Process	A majority of members from each state must vote to impose an obligation on such states. Must submit proposals to the constitutional processes of each state. Congressional consent not required.
Representation	President, vice president and president-elect of the Vermont and New Hampshire medical societies; President, president-elect, and executive director of the Maine Medical Association; Commissioners of health of the three states; Deans of the University of Vermont and Dartmouth Medical Schools; Chair of the Curriculum Committee and Director of Health Studies, University of Vermont Medical School.
Cooperation	Limited to serving the states of Vermont, Maine and New Hampshire, and the rural communities therein.
Reports	Separate biennial reports on actions and finances. Publishes bulletins.
Planning	Shall collect, correlate and evaluate the medical data in the three states and publish proposals.
Special Districts	None.
Funding	Gifts, fees from publications, contributions from member states, investment in secured notes and bonds.
Meetings and Actions	Mandatory meeting once a year.

Illustrations -- Group III
(With Statutory Citations)

Boundary, Water Quality and Water Resource Planning Entities

Case 8 -- Bi-State Development Agency

Illinois: I.R.S., Ch. 63, Sec. 361 et seq.
Missouri: Mo. Res. Stat. 1959, Sec. 70.370-440 (1949)
US Congress: 64 Stat. 568, as amended (1950)

Case 9 -- Interstate Sanitation Commission

Connecticut: Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann., Sec. 75-55 (1941)
New Jersey: N.J. Stat. Ann., Sec. 32:18-1 (1935)
New York: McK's. E.C.L., Sec. 21.051 (1936)
US Congress: Public Res. 62, 74th Cong. (1935)

Case 10 - Minnesota-Wisconsin Boundary Area Commission

Minnesota: Minn. Stat. Ann. 1.31 (1965)
Wisconsin: Ch. 274 of 1965; Wisc. Stat., 1975, Sec. 1482 (1965)

Case 11 - Sabine River Authority

Louisiana: La. Res. Stat. 38:2329 et seq. (1954)
Texas: Vernon's Tex. Civ. Stat. 1958, Art. 7466i (1953)
US Congress: 65 Stat. 736 (1951); 68 Stat. 690 (1954)

Case 8. Bi-State Development Agency

Purpose	Bilateral interstate cooperation in planning and development.
Membership Geographic Coverage	City of St. Louis and the counties of St. Louis, St. Charles and Jefferson all in Missouri; Madison, St. Clair and Monroe Counties in Illinois.
Powers and Duties	Plan, maintain, construct, own and operate bridges, tunnels, airports, terminals, sewage facilities, streets, highways, parking areas, recreation and conservation facilities and "all necessary and incidental functions" related to the compact.
Planning and Review Process	Present must be a majority of commissioners from each state to vote to approve a plan. The plan must comply with both the states' and Federal constitutions. Governor of each state may veto acts.
Representation	Five commissioners are appointed from each state; all must reside within the bistate region and be chosen under the terms specified by the legislature in each state.
Cooperation	Cooperates with local and national objectives in planning.
Reports	Must submit a "Comprehensive Plan for the Development of the District" to each legislature.
Planning	Responsible for the planning of housing, transportation, recreation and conservation facilities.
Special Districts	None.
Funding	Fees on use of facilities, issue bonds, Federal, state and local appropriations.
Meetings and Actions	Carried out at the discretion of the commission. Three commissioners from each state required to be present in order to conduct business.

Case 9. Interstate Sanitation Commission

Purpose	To control water and air pollution in the New York, New Jersey and Connecticut area.
Membership Geographic Coverage	The states of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut, limited to the coastal, tidal or estuarial waterways and adjacent and surrounding land and air in those states.
Powers and Duties	To set, maintain and enforce standards of water and air quality; conduct studies on the nature and effects of such pollution; conduct investigations and hearings.
Planning and Review Process	A majority of members from each state must vote in accordance for any action to be binding.
Representation	Five members from each state selected under legal procedures created by each state.
Cooperation	Cooperates with and advises civic organizations, respective state authorities, appropriate committees of Congress and any or all other Federal authorities having jurisdiction over such matters.
Reports	Reports annually to the governor and legislature of each state.
Planning	Prepares a general plan of the most practicable and economical method of securing conformity with the standards of the compact.
Special Districts	Creates the Interstate Sanitation District and divides it into Class "A" and Class "B".
Funding	The member states appropriate funds annually for expenses recommended by the commission and apportioned as 45 percent each from New York and New Jersey and 10 percent from Connecticut.
Meetings and Actions	Meets and acts at the agreement of the commissioners. Three members from each state must be present in order to conduct business.

Case 10. Minnesota-Wisconsin Boundary Area Commission

Purpose	Conduct studies and develop recommendations relating to the protection and development of boundary lands and waters.
Membership Geographic Coverage	The states of Minnesota and Wisconsin.
Powers and Duties	Joint regional planning for the development of boundary areas; propose measures of controlling air and water pollution, and other regulations.
Planning and Review Process	Actions not binding -- works by apparent consensus.
Representation	Five commissioners selected pursuant to the laws of each state.
Cooperation	Shall cooperate with the Federal government, and any public or private agencies with interest, authority and/or holdings on the boundary area.
Reports	Offers biennial reports in odd-numbered years; also publishes special studies, audits and minutes of each meeting.
Planning	Makes recommendations and studies of regional development, navigation, flood control, agriculture, fish and wildlife, recreation, housing, commerce, industry, air and water pollution, and any other related beneficial public purpose.
Special Districts	None.
Funding	May accept gifts, grants, and appropriations from Federal, state and local governments, any institution.
Meetings and Actions	Mandatory two meetings a year not in the same quarter, at the call of the Chairperson.

Case 11. Sabine River Authority

Purpose	To establish an authority to apportion the waters of the Sabine River and to plan, develop and conserve the water resources of the river basin in Louisiana and Texas.
Membership Geographic Coverage	The states of Louisiana and Texas.
Powers and Duties	The authority of this compact may: adopt bylaws; maintain an office; employ and discharge staff; purchase supplies and technical assistance; collect, analyze, correlate, compile and report on relevant data; contract with Federal and state agencies; and do all things necessary or convenient to carry out its functions. May own bridges, ferries, parks and land.
Planning and Review Process	Three votes by voting members are required for binding action. In case of a tie, either party may seek arbitration.
Representation	The authority of the compact consists of two members from each state serving either <u>ex officio</u> or by gubernatorial appointment. A representative of the United States chosen by the President will serve without vote.
Cooperation	Authorized to cooperate with the government of the US and may contribute financially toward improvement projects undertaken by the Federal government. May cooperate with all state agencies, departments and subdivisions of the member states.
Reports	The authority issues findings of fact, proposals and recommendations to the governor, legislature and courts of each state, and to agencies of government and committees of Congress.
Planning	Provides through practical and legal means coordination and control of the regulation of the waters of the Sabine River for storage, conservation, flood control, water supplies for cities and towns, irrigation, drainage, soil conservation, electric power generation, and public works.
Special Districts	None.
Funding	May issue bonds for the purchase or construction of facilities required by the authority; may collect tolls and fees from bridges, ferries, parks and other services. The remainder shall be financed by joint appropriation of the member states.
Meetings and Actions	Three voting members of the authority are required to conduct business; meets and acts by concurrence of at least three voting members.

Value and Use of Alternative Institutions

A consistent objective of the United States, supported by a broad consensus, has been and is now the development of comprehensive basin-wide plans for the management of the nation's water resources. ^{9/} This has been a national objective not limited solely to the Federal government. In establishing the Waterways Commission in 1917 the Congress sought "...comprehensive...plans...for the purposes of navigation and for every useful purpose." (Emphasis by authors) The Commission was also directed to give consideration not only to the work undertaken independently by the Federal government but to that which could be performed, "...by cooperation between the United States and the several states, political subdivisions thereof, municipalities, corporations, and individuals within the jurisdiction, powers, and rights of each, respectively..."

For 65 years extensive institutional experimentation has taken place within the Federal system as states and groups of states have sought to meet the objective of comprehensive, coordinated water resources planning and management. Most of the institutions developed during this period have been linked to, supported by or have acted in collaboration with the multiagency, congressionally controlled, water and related land resources programs of the Federal government. The record also shows quite clearly that the nation has not been willing to substitute a single type of organizational arrangement such as new TVA's, basinwide state or Federal-state compacts, river basin commissions or other entities for the mixed institutional system that now prevails. ^{10/}

This view has continued to be the position of the United States Water Resources Council. In 1967 the Council adopted a report of a task force on Alternative Institutional Arrangements for Managing River Basin Operations which concluded that: "The Federal Government should not, at least at this time, take a position favoring a single institutional arrangement for managing river basin operations." ^{11/}

This paper again proposes a consideration of alternative interstate institutions for accomplishing the objectives of the US Water Resources Council for water and related resources planning. At the same time it

^{9/} For a current restatement of the evolution of national objectives and the role of the several actors in the Federal system, see Schad, T. M. Water Resources Planning - Historical Development, Journal of the Water Resources Planning and Management Division; Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers; Vol. 105, No. WR1, March 1979, pp. 9-25.

^{10/} Dworsky, Leonard B. Existing Basin Agencies - How Well Do They Work. October 26, 1966 at Potomac Valley Leaders Conference. Paper available from 302 Hollister Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853.

^{11/} US Water Resources Council. Alternative Institutional Arrangements for Managing River Basin Operations, Washington, D. C., August 1967.

underscores the need to design an organization to meet a set of specific problems in a specific region that will best contribute to the welfare of its citizens and the nation, and to include sufficient flexibility to allow for change.

The value and use of the alternative institutions considered herein can be viewed from two perspectives: (1) that of the value and use of the institutional entity, and (2) that of the value and use of the process which the entity permits.

Following the publication of the report on Multistate Regionalism by the US Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in April 1972, Associate Director of the ACIR, David Walker, presented an analysis of Interstate Regional Instrumentalities in November 1972. ^{12/} While the emphasis of the paper is on Federal multistate regional partnerships, his comments on the "apparent accelerating popularity" of such instrumentalities applies equally well to other forms such as the alternative interstate institutions referenced in this paper.

"Regionalism in the American experience," David Walker notes, "is as old as the New England Confederation (1643)..." Apart from "regional interstate compact agencies, the Tennessee Vallee Authority, groupings of public officials on a regional basis,...there have been relatively few governmental institutions established on a sectional basis."

During the 1960s, he reports, all this changed. "The shift in the sixties then was in response to a new and different cluster of problems, the most significant of which was the spill-over character of certain pressing policy issues." Between 1961 and 1972 sixteen new Federal-multistate instrumentalities came into being (seven in the economic development field; nine in the water resources area).

In response to his query - Why this apparent accelerating popularity? Walker states:

...there has been a pressing need for achieving the necessary geographic scope to cope with certain program areas that transcend individual state boundaries and for providing a balanced vehicle for circumventing the limitations of traditional interstate compacts and agencies as well as Federally dominated regional com-ittes or governmental corporations. Some see in Federal-multistate bodies a means of procuring additional and less restricted Federal funds, above and beyond regular grants-in-aid and achieving additional impact on Federal policy and administration decisions in their respective program areas. Others see a means by which one level of government may exercise additional influence over another level. With some of their more nationally oriented proponents, the commissions serve as a subtle but positive way of avoiding some of the constraints of

^{12/} Walker, David. Interstate Regional Instrumentalities: A New Piece of an Old Puzzle. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, November, 1972.

the Federal-single-state relationship: Some contend that the process of governors or their deputies and a Federal member or members interacting and deciding certain questions tends to produce a viewpoint, a planning process, and a method of implementation that are neither state nor Federally dominated, but subnational and suprastate in nature. They further suggest that these are the best bases for effective decentralization in the seventies...13/

From whatever vantage point, it appears that new gains, flexibility and innovation are possible from carefully designed interstate cooperative ventures. The alternative opportunities considered in this paper should prove to be of value to the participants in the area of water and related land resources planning. At the outset, however, it is not claimed that potential benefits result exclusively as the product of the suggested array of alternative institutions. Clearly, there are many ways to achieve these benefits depending on the initiative of planning managers and other decision-making officials.

Basin planning under an interstate institutional initiative can:

- be designed in consideration of the specific problems of the basin;
- reflect the unique physical, cultural, economic and political character of the basin, and the relation of the basin to the adjoining region;
- maintain, on a current basis, the most practical and effective allocation of functions and responsibilities among local, state and Federal entities where responsibilities are shared;
- provide for a better responsiveness to the public who share the basin but not the same political institutions;
- strengthen and support a continuous, comprehensive planning process;
- provide more ready agreement on reserving some common interstate problems for the future;
- provide an improved arena for conflict resolution while still preserving the essential prerogative of the Congress, state legislatures and local general governments;
- provide a means for individual members to be aware of other members' actions and interests and of available or alternate means to implement programs not possible on an individual basis;

- provide a guide to needed state/local action to support basinwide programs; and
- allow for experimentation and program differentiation on a more manageable scale.

Most of these benefits are self-evident and provide no new information to experienced state officers or others in the water planning field. However, the benefits are real, and if the long-term objective is comprehensive basinwide water and related resources planning and management, then development of an institution to facilitate cooperation among states and between states and the Federal government, is essential.

For Source Material, Contact

Council of State Governments Iron Works Pike Lexington, Kentucky 40578	U.S. Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration Office of Chief Counsel 14th Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20230
Leonard B. Dworsky 302 Hollister Hall Cornell University Ithaca, New York 14853	U.S. Government Printing Office North Capitol and H Streets, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20401
Idaho Research Foundation, Inc. P. O. Box 3367 University Station Moscow, Idaho 83843	U.S. Water Resources Council 2120 L Street, N.W. Washington D. C. 20037
Minnesota-Wisconsin Boundary Area Comm. 619 Second Street Hudson, Wisconsin 54016	
National Technical Information Service 425 Thirteenth Street, N.W. Room 620 Washington, D.C.	
Southern Growth Policies Board c/o E. Blaine Liner P. O. Box 12293 Research Triangle Park, N. C. 27709	
Southern Regional Education Board 130 Sixth Street, N.W. Atlanta, Georgia 30313	
Tri-State Regional Planning Commission 1 World Trade Center, 82nd Floor New York, New York 10048	
U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations Suite 2000 Vanguard Building 1111 Twentieth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20575 (Publisher of <u>Intergovernmental Perspective</u>)	

Annotated Bibliography

"A System Overloaded: American Federalism 1959-1979." Intergovernmental Perspective:6:1, 1980.

Current review of trends in intergovernmental relations. Outlines important developments over the past 20 years and the impact of changes on various governmental units.

Council of State Governments. Interstate Compacts and Agencies. Lexington, Ky.: Council of State Governments, 1979.

Directory of interstate arrangements listed by topic. Includes boundary, conservation, corrections, education, health, motor vehicles, nuclear energy, parks and recreation, planning and development, property, public safety, taxation and transportation, water apportionment, pollution, resources and flood control. Has indices by compacts and by states.

. Natural Resource Data Needs Recommendations. Lexington, Ky.: The Council of State Governments, 1976.

Data users and their needs. Data uses; format needs; accessibility and responsiveness in the provision of data.

. Water Resources and Economic Development in the South. Knoxville, Tenn.: Agricultural Policy Institute, 1965.

Delineates water resources problems in southern states related to regional economic growth.

Dworsky, Leonard B. "Existing Basin Agencies: How Well Do They Work?" Paper presented at the Potomac Valley Leaders Conference on River Basin Agencies and Compacts -- What's Next for the Potomac, 1966.

A critical evaluation of basin management. Addresses important topics and questions on the roles and relationships of entities involved in water resource planning. Considers various types of basin agencies giving positive and negative points of each.

Friedman, Samuel K. et al. Focus on Regional Cooperation, North-South Summit. Washington, D.C.: Northeast-Midwest Institute, 1978.

Conference between regional leaders on the growth of regionalism, interregional competition and cooperation.

Godschalk, David R., Bruce J. M. Knopf and Seth G. Weissman. Guiding Growth in the South. Research Triangle Park, N.C.: Southern Growth Policies Board, 1978.

Explains the need for state growth, management and planning due to burgeoning population growth in the South. Surveys local government authorities common throughout the region. Condenses major goals, policies and problems in each state. Gives government roles in stimulating growth and tools for coping with the fiscal, economic and environmental impacts of growth.

Hanson, Royce. Metroplitan Councils of Governments. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1966.

Describes the cooperation of metropolitan governmental units. Gives the origins, activities, functions and problems of Councils of Government. Surveys competing organizations. Addresses limitations, outlines organizational structure. Relates Councils of Government with their component parts. Appendices illustrate legal bases of Councils of Government, Federal policies on financial assistance to Councils of Government, Housing and Urban Development involvement. Bibliography.

Hart, Gary W. Institutions for Water Planning. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1971.

Covers critically the current institutional arrangement for water resource planning. Background, legislative history of water planning prior to the Water Resources Planning Act. Analyzes Title II of Water Resources Planning Act. Describes major institutions, gives case studies, summarizes strengths and weaknesses of principal water planning institutions, presents alternatives and recommendations. Appendices list institutions, river basins covered, examples of charters of an Inter-Agency Group, a River Basin Commission, the list of Texas River Authorities. Bibliography.

Holmes, Beatrice Hart. History of Federal Water Resource Programs and Policies, 1961-1970. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, September 1979.

A comprehensive account of major Federal programs and policies relating to conservation and development of water and related land resources during the 1960s. Discusses relevant Federal legislation and the functions of Federal and Federally assisted programs involving research, planning, construction and regulation. National, regional and local issues related to water

programs and policies; presidential, congressional and agency policy-making processes and environmental movement's effects on water programs and policies also discussed.

Ingram, Helen. The New England River Basin Commission. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1971.

A case study of one of the more successful River Basin Commissions, with reasons for its success. Gives a short history on the New England River Basin Commission and shows the shortcomings and problems that it confronted and that continue to exist. Participants in and roles of the Commission.

Liner, E. Blaine and Lawrence K. Lynch. The Economics of Southern Growth. Durham, N.C.: The Southern Growth Policies Board, 1977.

Essays by Revlin Askew, E. E. Brunson, Charles Haywood, Russell Howard, C. L. Jusenius, L. C. Ledebur, Madelyn Lockhart, William Miernyk, and Mancur Olsen. A comparative, structural, causal and qualitative analysis on Southern Growth. Contains special studies on finance, income distribution, energy and popular misconceptions of the South.

Maloney, Frank E., ed. Interstate Water Compacts. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1975.

A bibliography arranged by Accession number with significant descriptor, comprehensive and author indices. Also a bibliography of bibliographies.

Michalson, Edgar L., Ernest A. Engelbert, and Wade Andrews, eds. Multiple Objective Planning Water Resources. Moscow, Idaho: Idaho Research Foundation, Inc., 1974.

Identifies various problem areas in water planning and management for multiple-objective planning. Addressed to all major planners of water resources.

Minnesota-Wisconsin Boundary Area Commission. Report(s) to the Governors and Legislators, 1967.

Annual report presenting accomplishments and recommendations.

Schad, T. M. "Water Resources Planning -- Historical Development." Journal of the Water Resources Planning and Management Division; Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, 105 No. WR1 March 1979:9-25.

A current restatement of the evolution of national objectives and the role of actors in the Federal system.

Southern Regional Education Board. Ecology and Agricultural Production. Knoxville, Tenn.: University of Tennessee Press, 1977.

Papers presented on the relationship between education, ecology and farm management. Government and business policies related to ecology and agricultural production.

_____. Regional Economic Research and Planning on the Coastal Plains Region. Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, 1967.

Technical study of economic research and planning commissioned by the Economic Development Agency. Led to the creation of an EDA Title V commission. Dealt only with North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia counties below the Fall Line.

Tri-State Regional Planning Commission. Annual Report(s), 1975-6.

Report addressed to local, state and Federal government bodies issued annually, showing planning, project proposals, policy statements, budget.

_____. Regional Development Guide, 1977-2000. New York: Tri-State Regional Planning Commission, 1978.

Projects regional growth and development, metropolitan needs, basic planning requirements. Maps and illustrations.

US Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. A Handbook for Interlocal Agreements and Contracts. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, March 1967.

Shows various forms of intergovernmental cooperation, primarily at local level. Lists a variety of goods and services provided by governments jointly or by contracts with other governments. Many useful forms, models. Appendices with examples of contracts and agreements.

_____. Multistate Regionalism. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, April 1972.

Concept and growth of multistate regionalism; historical background; Federal role in regionalism. Reasons for multistate undertakings; initiators of programs. Examples of Federal multistate programs. Findings, recommendations and policy positions. Appendices on other policy positions, expenditures and grants related to Federal multistate programs. 43 tables, 7 figures.

Regionalism Revisited. Washington, D.C.:
US Government Printing Office, 1977.

Subtitled "Recent Areawide and Local Responses". A study of substate regionalism. Gives reasons for substate regional governmental arrangements and the growth of such arrangements. Challenges shortcomings and difficulties encountered by substate regional entities. Appendices on local government modernization, index of major topics and substate regional recommendations of the Advisory Council on Intergovernmental Relations.

State Legislative Program 1970. Subject No. 87-20-00,
"State Water Resources Planning and Coordination," Washington, D.C.:
US Government Printing Office, August 1966.

Suggested legislation for state governments to administer water resources. Presents a model law based largely on Oregon law.

State Legislative Program 1975 Part 1 - State Government Structure and Processes. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1975.

Covers state legislative and executive branch reforms. More importantly, Chapter 3 deals with the relationship between Federal and local governments. Suggests legislation to promote cooperation, mutual assistance and better intergovernmental relations.

State Legislative Program Part 2 - Local Government Modernization. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1975.

Proposes legislation to modernize local governments and their relations with state and Federal governments. Chapter 3 deals with the creation of areawide units, such as substate districts, interstate multijurisdictional organizations, metropolitan multijurisdictional organizations, regional service corporations and others. Table 1 of this paper is loosely modeled on requirements for interstate multijurisdictional organizations presented here.

State Legislative Program 1975 Part 5 - Environment, Land Use and Growth Policy. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1975.

Gives models of laws with planning, zoning and the provision of governmental services. Chapter on state growth policies outlines means of controlling growth through loans, taxes, regulation and other policies. Chapter on land use and environmental planning and regulation deals with ways of protecting the environment that conform to the Federal Constitution and the constitutions of most states.

US Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Government Operations. Government in Metropolitan Areas. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1961.

Outlines suggestions made before Congress by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations that formed the backbone of Metropolitan Councils of Governments. Other structural recommendations were made before the committee in the form of testimony.

US Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration, Office of Chief Counsel. Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, As Amended. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1977.

Unofficial reprint of P.L. 89-136; 42 U.S.C. 3121 et. seq. as amended through 1976 (P.L. 94-487).

US Water Resources Council. Alternative Institutional Arrangements for Managing River Basin Operations. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1967.

Examines institutional arrangements developed over the years by state and Federal governments for managing river basins. Reviews eight types of management arrangements. Concludes that while no one arrangement is best under all circumstances, only three types can be of any use. Also concludes that the functioning of any arrangement is contingent upon local conditions.

. The Nation's Water Resources, 1975-2000. Volume 1 -- Summary. Volume 2 -- Water Quantity, Quality and Related Land Considerations. Volume 3 -- Analytical Data. Volume 4 -- Water Resource Regional Reports. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1979.

Comprehensive survey of water and related land resources. Looks at water supply and consumption on macro- and micro-scales. Examines critical problems facing the United States water supply. Details crucial water management problems forecasted over the next twenty years; water usage; supply and quality considerations in Volume 2. Volume 3 gives assumptions and method used to collect data and has 19 tables and 8 illustrations of nationwide data. Volume 4 contains detailed coverage of each of the 20 water resource regions.

. State of the States: Water Resource Planning and Management. Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office, 1980.

Report on Water Resources Council tasks and problems related to water planning and management. Summarizes the conditions

of the various states in these areas. Appendices on responsibilities; Title III funded agencies; plans and studies addressing problems in water management and planning effort. References.

Walker, David Bradstreet. "Interstate Regional Instrumentalities: A New Piece in an Old Puzzle." AID Journal, November 1972:359-68.

Documents the rise of interstate governmental entities given various functions. Gives major reasons underlying growing interstate cooperation. Compares the Appalachia Regional Commission, Economic Development Act Title V Commissions, Water Resource and Planning Act Title II Commissions and compact commissions. Draws conclusions based on similarities between the different interstate entities of government.

Wendell, U. Schwan. Intergovernmental Relations in Water Resource Activities. Washington, D.C.: NTIS Publications, 1972.

A study of governmental roles in the Federal system applied to water resources. Describes cooperation and assistance given by governments to achieve goals in planning and management of water resources. Detailed narrative on mechanisms used for interlocal cooperation.